



November 15, 2006

**Subject: The Land Development Ordinance Committee**

The Land Development Ordinance Committee (LDOC) met Wednesday, November 15, 2006, at 4 p.m., in the second floor Seminar Room located at The Plaza, 100 W. Innes Street, to discuss rewriting Salisbury's ordinance code. In attendance were Jake Alexander, George Busby, Bill Burgin (Co-chair), John Casey, Steve Fisher, Mark Lewis (Co-chair), Brian Miller, Rodney Queen, Jeff Smith, and Victor Wallace.

**Absent**—Karen Alexander, Phil Conrad, Johnny Safrit, Bill Wagoner, and Dee Dee Wright

**Staff Present**—Janet Gapen, Dan Mikkelson, Preston Mitchell, Diana Moghrabi, Joe Morris, David Phillips, Lynn Raker, Patrick Ritchie, and John Vest

**The meeting was called to order** with Mark Lewis (Co-chair) presiding. The minutes of the November 8, 2006, meeting were accepted as published.

**HOUSEKEEPING**

Joe Morris provided an updated schedule for future meetings. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 29, from 4–6 p.m. in the Plaza Seminar room. We will skip Thanksgiving week.

**CHAPTER SUMMARIES**

Chapter 3 revisions are not ready. Preston distributed updates on Chapter 4 for discussion. This chapter addresses concerns for future infill development. 4.3A Purpose was fine. 4.3B all three criteria must be met. Janet Gapen was asked to bring information about current vacant lots in the City of Salisbury.

Building Type Compatibility Standards were covered in 4.3C, discussed at length, and found to be confusing. Singles, duplexes, and quads are good facing each other when possible. It was noted that currently zoning boundaries run centerline.

This steps beyond what we have. The committee asked to step back and look at the goal when discussing vacant lots, houses of a certain style, and protection of the block. This allows new uses. Existing neighborhoods get quads that look appropriate. The setback is being relaxed. George Busby asked about incentive.

A recent Planning Board case on Bringle Ferry Road brought up the point of tearing down existing homes. Higher density is not a solution. Many scenarios were then discussed and the committee found it fear that "crackerbox" housing would somehow be established. Should the foundation then match the area? Square footage? (Must specify certain elements.) 4.3C #3 will be rewritten and worded so it does not undermine existing residential neighborhoods.

In 4.3D it was decided to strike *Density* in the title. A picture will be embedded. David Phillips pointed out that a block in the county is measured as one-tenth of a mile. There was a great deal of discussion about subdividing a lot and how wide it be allowed to be. Examples of lots on an "s" curve and a cul-de-sac suggested that the average will be determined by removing the top (high) and bottom (low) numbers, and averaging the lot size at 100 percent. The committee voted to accept this manner of determining a lot size.

Section 4.3D-1.b.—The committee suggested that the rewrite measure for lot averaging be 300' in both directions; drop the block face. In a corner division, subdividing a lot would be based on the direction that the lot is being divided. The obstacle of a major or minor thoroughfare would be cleaned up in the text. The committee asked if 300' is an arbitrary number and Lynn Raker pointed out some discrepancies. Staff will address this at the Monday meeting.

It was decided that the section on setbacks was OK. The exceptions process would be to request a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. **Access Compatibility Standards** raised no issues. The infill standards were well covered.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

DM